

USSN 10/802,486

Remarks

Claims 1, 3-5, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by Keller (USP 1,345,783). The Examiner argues that Keller teaches a ticket comprising all of the components of these claims. The applicants have amended Claim 1 to require that each slot of the identification marker extends to an edge of the marker that is generally parallel to the length of the elongated object when the marker is attached to the object. Support for this amendment is found in Figures 6-7, 9a and 11b. Moreover, new Claim 22 further requires that the slots extend from the holes to the same edge of the marker, and support for this claim is found in the specification at page 3, lines 10-11 and in Figures 1-4, 6-7, 9a and 11b. The slots of the Keller ticket not only extend to an edge of the ticket that is generally perpendicular to the garment or garment hanger from which it hangs, but the slots also extend to different edges of the ticket. The arrangement of the slots on the applicants' identification marker make for a more secure grip to the elongated object than is provided by the Keller ticket.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by Jaffe (USP 4,539,767). Here too, the Examiner argues that the Jaffe wire marker teaches all of the components of the applicants' identification marker. However, the Jaffe marker does not teach a cut or slot; rather the notch of the Jaffe marker is in open communication with the opening. In contrast, the opening of the applicants' identification marker is connected to the notch by a slot.

Claims 1-5 and 16 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by Bush et al. (US Des. 281,102). The Examiner argues that Bush et al. teach a device comprising a flexible member having a surface adapted to receive indicia, a pair of oval openings, and a slot extending from the inner edge of the opening to the edge of the device. The applicants' marker differs from the Bush et al. device on at least two levels. First, the Bush et al. device

USSN 10/802,486

is not an identification marker; rather it is an air freshener. As such, it is not adapted to engage a wire in a manner that allows it to act as a useful identification marker. As shown in Figure 6 of Bush et al., it simply hangs loosely from a wire.

On a second level, and similar to the short coming of the Jaffe teaching, the Bush et al. device does not have a slot that connects a notch to an opening. Rather, the "notch" is in direct and open communication with the opening.

Finally, Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 13, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by Rieger (USP 2,669,047). Here again, the Examiner argues that Rieger's tag for produce comprises all of the components of the applicants' identification marker. However, and similar to the Keller clothing ticket, the cuts or slots of the Rieger tag neither extend to an edge that is generally parallel to the length of the elongated object to which it is attached, nor do they extend to the same edge.

Applicants acknowledge allowance of Claims 8-12, 14-15, 17-18 and 20-21. The Examiner's objections to the photographs and drawings will be addressed upon the close of examination.

The applicants have addressed and traversed each and every rejection, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw each rejection and allow all of the rejected claims.

Dated: 28 April 05

Respectfully submitted,  
*Gary R. Plotecher*  
Gary R. Plotecher  
Registration No. 27830

WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C.  
555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-3819  
(414) 273-2100  
Customer No. 022202